

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 4, 6, 11, 13, 16, 22, 27, 29, 34, 36, and 55 are amended.

Claims 1-23, 25-44 and 54-56 are pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-23, 25-44 and 54-56 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are rejected as being anticipated by AutoCAD (AutoCAD User's Guide, AutoDesk Dec 5th, 1997).

The rejections are traversed.

STATEMENT ON SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicant's representative conducted an in-person interview with the Examiner on March 9, 2005. During the interview, the Applicant's representative pointed out features of the present invention that patentably distinguish over the cited art. In particular, a "set displaying plane" was discussed, and that the Examiner's interpretation of the same was not correct. Thus, the Examiner's contentions, regarding AutoCAD as discussing recited features in support of the rejections, are incorrect.

In addition, Applicant's representative pointed out to the Examiner that features of the independent claims are supported by the current drawings and discussed in the specification in a manner to clearly point out the claimed subject for examination. Other matters discussed are included below.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the opportunity to conduct an in-person interview.

ITEM 3: OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

In item 3, the Examiner objects to the drawings contending the "informal drawings are not of sufficient quality to permit examination." (Action at page 2).

As discussed during the in-person interview, Applicant submits that each of the features of the independent claims are supported by the drawings and discussed in the specification in a manner to clearly point out the claimed subject matter. For example, features of a device for displaying a body section as recited by claim 1 are clearly pointed out as follows: "management means for managing attribute information of parts and arranging information of a set displaying plane for making a body section defined based on a plane of one of a parts" (see, for example, FIG. 1, management unit 11 as discussed in paragraph [00116]), "implementing means for generating a three-dimensional section of the body cut by the set displaying plane according to the management data of the management means and for displaying the three dimension section with the set displaying plane on the display screen" (see, for example, FIG. 1, implementing unit

12 discussed in paragraphs [00117]-[00118]); "up-date means for up-dating the arranged information managed by the management means by corresponding to the transfer or rotation of the set displaying plane" (see, for example, FIG. 1, updating unit 13 discussed in paragraphs [00119]).

Applicant request the objection be withdrawn and that the drawings are of sufficient quality to permit examination.

ITEMS 4-6: OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 4, 16, AND 27

In items 4-6, the Examiner objects to claims 4, 16, and 27 because of informalities. (Action at pages 2-3). The Examiner suggests that the term "pale" in claims 4 and 27 should be replaced with the term --plane--, and the term --setting-- in claim 16 should be replaced with the term --section--.

Claims 4, 16, and 27 are amended herein as suggested by the Examiner, and as discussed during the in-person interview, and withdrawal of the objection is requested.

ITEM 7: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 6 AND 29 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In item 7, the Examiner objects to claims 6 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. The Examiner contends that:

base claims 2 and 25 request a device for displaying a body section in a virtual three-dimensional space, claims 6 and 29 recite displaying the set displaying planes with transparent color when three-dimensional section is not displayed. The base claim requires two things but the dependent claim eliminates one of those things, the three-dimensional section..

(Action at page 3).

Claims 6 and 29 are rewritten herein so as to be in independent form, as discussed during the in-person interview and comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

ITEM 8: REJECTION OF CLAIM 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In item 8, the Examiner rejects claims 11, 13, 34, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph contending that the term "just before from" in claims is vague and indefinite. (Action at page 3).

As discussed during the in-person interview, claims 11, 13, 34, and 36 are amended herein and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

ITEM 9: REJECTION OF CLAIM 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In item 9, the Examiner rejects claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph contending that the term "managing data" is vague and indefinite because "the term "managing data" is not defined by the claim, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably appraised of the scope of the invention."

As discussed during the in-person interview, claim 22 is amended herein and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

ITEM 10: REJECTION OF CLAIM 55 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In item 10, the Examiner rejects claim 55 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph contending that the term "the set displaying plane" in line 4 and 7 of claim 55 is vague and indefinite. (Action at page 4).

As discussed during the in-person interview, Applicant points out to the Examiner that the term in lines 4 and 7 of "the set displaying plane" is a modifier to the term "display(s) parts" and not to just a set displaying plane. Claim 55 is amended herein to clarify the same and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

ITEMS 12-27: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-23, 25-44 AND 54-56 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY AUTOCAD

In items 12-27 of the Action, the Examiner rejects all pending claims 1-23, 25-44 and 54-56 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by AutoCAD. The rejections are traversed.

Independent claims 1, 2, 22, 23, and 25 using claim 1 as an example, recite a device for displaying a body section, a method, and a computer readable storage, using claim 1 as an example, including "management means for managing attribute information of parts and arranging information of a set displaying plane for making a body section defined based on a plane of one of a parts; implementing means for generating a three-dimensional section of the body cut by the set displaying plane according to the management data of the management means, and for displaying the three dimension section with the set displaying plane on the display screen; and up-date means for up-dating the arranged information managed by the management means by corresponding to the transfer or rotation of the set displaying plane." (Emphasis added).

Independent claims 6 and 29 recite a device for displaying a body section in a virtual three-dimensional space or a set displaying plane by a computer including, using claim 6 as an example, "displaying the set displaying plane with a transparent color, when the three-dimensional section is not displayed."

As discussed during the in-person interview, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's contentions in support of the rejection are not correct in that the Examiner's understanding of a "set displaying plane" as recited by the claims of the present invention was not correct. Thus, the Examiner's contentions, regarding AutoCAD as discussing recited features in support of the rejections, are incorrect.

For example, the Examiner contends that a device including "management means for managing attribute information of parts and arranging information of a set displaying plane for making a body section defined based on a plane of one of a parts" is discussed by:

orders given by the template file, Page 441, Line 8 of a set displaying plane for making a body section defined based on a plane of one of a parts [3D drawing with front and back clipping planes, Page 532, Figs].
(Action at page 5).

However, AutoCAD merely discusses on page 532 setting a front and back clipping plane, e.g., a plane of one of a parts. AutoCAD does not discuss the "set displaying plane."

As another example, in support of the rejection of claim 2, the Examiner contends that :
AutoCAD teaches management means [creating, editing, attaching, Page 438 – 439] for managing attribute information of parts [extracts information from the drawing, Page 441, Line 4] and one or plural kinds of attribute information [extracts information from the drawing, Page 441, Line 4] of set displaying plane for making a body section with the relation between the parts and the attribute information [Spherical Projection warps the texture both horizontally and vertically].
(Action at page 6).

However, AutoCAD merely discusses (page 440-441) that "(y)ou can extract attribute information from a drawing and create a separate text after you create a template file, Auto CAD uses that file to determine what attribute information to extract from the file, " and (page 614) that a "spherical projection warps the texture both horizontally and vertically."

AutoCAD does not discuss managing attribute information of parts and one or plural kinds of attribute information of a set displaying plane, as the Examiner contends.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections and allowance of claims 1-23 and 25-44 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 2, 2005

By: Paul W. Boboweic
Paul W. Boboweic
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501